LABOR POWER

Official Organ of the Socialist Union Party

ONLY SOCIALISM CAN DESTROY FASCISM

VOLUME 2 JUNE, 1941 NUMBER 12

WAR AIMS

"This war, basically is being fought to determine who is to make and enforce the rules for running the world; who to control the seas; who to have the privilege of pushing other people around."

United States News.

Thomas Whitewashes Lindbergh

●

Labor Fakers at Work

●

We Are in the War

●

Blitzkrieg Against Labor

Published by the Socialist Union Party,
140 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

PRICE 5 CENTS

Thomas Whitewashes Lindbergh

The bankruptcy of the policy of pacifism within the labor movement was strikingly illustrated by the recent action of Norman Thomas in coming to the defense of ex-Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh, the fair-haired boy of American Fascism.

The *Call,* official organ of the Socialist Party, carried an article in its May 10th issue by Frank N. Trager entitled "The Ex-Colonel" in which the fascist background of Lindbergh's supporters was described. Trager recently resigned from the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party because of his disagreement with the Thomas war position. Trager supports the imperialist war as a struggle against Fascism.

In his article Trager had no difficulty in demonstrating, by reference to Lindbergh's recent magazine articles and radio addresses that Lindbergh is an insidious apologist for Hitler and Hitlerism. Particularly he pointed to Lindbergh's support of the Nazi doctrine of Aryan supremacy and his failure publicly to condemn the Hitler regime. Trager likewise called attention to the fact that while some portions of Lindbergh's speeches may appear to the unwary to be innocent of any Fascist implications, such disingenuousness is a characteristic of all skilled Nazi propaganda. The article concluded by calling upon "all liberals, democrats and Socialists" to repudiate and publicly condemn the ex-Colonel.

In the next issue of the *Call,* Norman Thomas accepted the challenge. In an article entitled "The Case of Lindbergh," he came to the defense of the isolationist champion. But Thomas's article is more than a defense; it constitutes an outright apology and as sorry a job of whitewash as was ever attempted.

LINDBERGH'S NAZI MEDAL

First of all, Thomas takes up the charge that Lindbergh has refused to return the medal tendered him by the Nazis during his stay in Germany some years ago. Thomas repeats straight the official Lindbergh justification for his conduct: The medal came to him unsought, "he received it when he was in Germany in the service of America, at a dinner at the American Embassy which he was requested to attend." Whether Lindbergh now returns his Nazi medal or not is of course of no moment. What is significant is that Norman Thomas, who professes to be a Socialist, sees nothing wrong in the acceptance of a Nazi medal by a servant of American imperialism.

THOMASONIAN LOGIC

Next Thomas proceeds to dispose of Trager's charge that Lindbergh is a fervid propagandist of the Nazi racial doctrine of Aryan superiority. As far as Thomas is personally concerned, he of course rejects this poisonous Nazi concoction outright. But this does not prevent him from exculpating Lindbergh for his views. He presents Lindbergh's position as "evidence of characteristic American confusion." And he informs us that anyway it was not Lindbergh but the Englishman, Rudyard Kipling, who was the father of the doctrine of white supremacy which Lindbergh has adopted. Furthermore, it is a doctrine held by the overwhelming majority of Americans, and our Southern members of Congress are given to far more crass and extreme statements of white supremacy. All this makes everything all right as far as Lindbergh is concerned, in Thomas's estimation.

Let us apply a little of Thomas's logic to another question. The Nazis advocate the raising of anti-semitism to the dignity of a governmental philosophy. This is a doctrine that is abhorrent to and rejected by all decent-minded people. Very well. But, let us remember, Hitler is not the originator of anti-semitism; it existed long before he appeared on the political scene. Further, the great majority of the German people endorse Hitler's anti-semitic principles, so we really cannot blame Hitler personally too much. Finally, there is no difference between the Southern members of Congress with their support of Jim Crow practices, and the Hitler regime with its sponsorship of Jewish persecution. On the basis of this peculiar Thomasonian reasoning every villain in history would have an alibi!

It is in his reply to the charge that Lindbergh has never publicly repudiated Hitler and the fascist regime, that Thomas reaches the depths of fatuity. Of course Thomas disapproves of this failure on the part of Lindbergh. But how does Thomas express this

(*Continued on page* 11)

LABOR POWER

Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY
140 Fourth Avenue
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Subscription Rates — Per Year, 50c;
Semi-Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.
Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 2, No. 12 **June, 1941**

Editorials . . .

BLITZKRIEG AGAINST LABOR

The masquerade is over. Roosevelt, who for eight years played the role of "Labor's Best Friend" has now taken off the mask. From beneath the greasepaint and the fixed smile there emerges the real countenance of Roosevelt, American capitalism's Strikebreaker No. 1.

Out in Inglewood, California, 12,000 airplane workers employed by the North American Aviation Corp. tired of the run-around they were getting at the hands of the bosses and the National Defense Mediation Board went out on strike. In the twinkling of an eye capitalism's blitzkrieg against labor was let loose with all its fury.

Attorney-General Jackson, President Roosevelt's chief stooge, opened up with a blast denouncing the strike as being "more like an insurrection than a labor strike—a conspiracy against the government by labor leaders who follow the Communist Party line." The press and the radio immediately took up the cry and blazoned it in headlines across the continent.

F.D.R. CRACKS DOWN

The President issued an Executive Order directing the Secretary of War to take over and operate the struck plant. Since the army cannot produce planes, it is obvious that what was intended was to bulldoze the strikers into returning to work. The first concrete measure taken under the "Unlimited National Emergency" recently proclaimed by the President thus was the dispatch of 3000 Federal troops, under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Charles E. Branshaw to take complete control of the North American plant at Inglewood.

In Washington, General Lewis B. Hershey, Acting Director of the Selective Service Administration, followed up this move under orders from the President, by directing 6500 local draft boards to reclassify all workers in so-called "defense" industries "who have ceased to perform their jobs." Immediately almost 100 strikers at North American were notified by their local boards that they had lost their 2-A deferment classification because they were no longer aircraft workers and were not "necessary" to national "defense." They were put in Class 1-A, subject to immediate induction and orders to take physical examinations at once. Hershey's order directly contradicts one issued only a few weeks before in which the local boards were directed not to change a "defense" worker's status merely because he was out on strike.

Not only were the striking workers attacked from without but they were betrayed by their own international officers. Vice-President Frankensteen and President R. J. Thomas of the U.A.W., the C.I.O. union with which the North American strikers are affiliated, as well as Philip Murray, C.I.O. president, denounced the strike as unauthorized. Local union officials who stood by the strikers were summarily removed, the local placed in "receivership" and the workers threatened with blacklisting by the U.A.W. if they did not immediately return to work.

LABOR UNDER ARMY CONTROL

Meanwhile, at Inglewood, Col. Branshaw assumed command of the strike-bound plant and immediately clamped down with all the rules of military occupation. He announced to the strikers, in a statement telling them to resume work, that "there is no need for negotiations. The men have been invited to return to work. It is just as patriotic a duty to turn out airplanes as it is to wear a uniform." Of course, the Colonel was speaking out of turn here, for publicly the policy of the Roosevelt administration is all for negotiation, provided there is no interruption in work. The Colonel's words have deep significance nevertheless. They serve to give an insight into the fascist mentality of the American officer caste.

Among the first acts of Col. Branshaw, was to suspend seven of the eight members of the local union negotiating committee from their jobs, pending investigation. In addition, three other men who had been active in the union were dismissed.

The "wildcat" strike of the North American Aviation workers was quickly broken. The men could not hold out against the combined forces of the company, the United States government and their own labor leader betrayers. With their return to work the Roosevelt strike-breaking role has been successfully launched. A new pattern for the "pacification" of labor has been set. President Roosevelt announced that while he hopes to avoid further use of the army to reopen struck plants, he is prepared to do so again if the necessity arises. In other words, Roosevelt prefers to use the velvet glove, but the mailed fist is ready if the workers fail to heed.

GOVERNMENT BY DECREE

An interesting sidelight on the President's new role as strikebreaker is the fact that in taking over the North American plant, he acted by virtue of a decree issued in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief and not by authority of any law on the statute books. Yet not a single capitalist voice was raised in condemnation of this dictatorial act. When Hitler acts by decree, that is fascism, you see. But when Roosevelt acts by decree, that is safeguarding American liberty and democracy. Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, isolationist leader and one of the leaders of the Republican opposition, forgot all his hostility in applauding the President's act. "It is perfectly clear," said Senator Taft, "that the President had no authority to do what he did yesterday. Since I believe it is a good thing, since I am willing to authorize him to do it, I think we should authorize him now so that no question will arise." O consistency, thou art indeed a rare jewel!

CORP. PRECIPITATED STRIKE

One of the pretexts on which the President's use of the armed forces to break the strike is justified by the press is the charge that the strike was a Communist conspiracy hatched out to embarrass and sabotage the "National Defense." The Socialist Union Party holds no brief for Stalin and his American agents. But a fouler slander against American workers was never uttered. We do not at all deny that Stalinists and their labor agents may have, under their usual false colors, worked themselves into key positions in the local union. But the strike was not an act of the union officialdom. It was the free and voluntary act of as loyal and patriotic a bunch of capitalist-minded workers as there is to be found anywhere in the country.

In stating this incontrovertible fact, we as revolutionary Socialists, do so most sorrowfully. These unfortunate workers, we realize full well, were and continue to be blind to their true class interests. In striking, they were in no manner protesting against the damnable capitalist system which has convulsed the world in a war of mutual extermination and is rapidly driving society toward universal fascist barbarism. Their strike was merely a protest against the run-around they were getting at the hands of their employers and the government in response to their very modest request for a wage increase.

The workers were deliberately goaded into striking by a greedy, scheming and conniving corporation which hoped to be able, in the reaction, to destroy the union. Ralph Ingersoll, publisher of the New York newspaper *PM*, who supported the President's action in using the troops to break the strike, in a signed editorial accused the corporation of responsibility for the strike. "First," he wrote, "the employers' precipitation of the strikes seems unnecessary and unpatriotic. What business had North American Aviation Company paying its men 50 cents an hour when the going rate of the industry is 62½ cents?"

And here we have the long and short of it. It was the piling up of just and onerous grievances that finally forced the Inglewood workers to strike and to defy the President's request to go back. If those grievances had not existed a thousand Stalinist agitators could not have succeeded in pulling them out.

* * *

TWO STRIKES — A CONTRAST!

Those workers who still are naive enough to believe that the United States is a true democracy where there are no classes, where all are equal before the law, will do well to contrast the treatment received by the North American Aviation workers under the new

Roosevelt strikebreaking regime with the treatment accorded to their employers, the Aviation moguls, when they went on a "sit-down" strike in the Spring of 1940 against the law passed by Congress limiting to 8% the profits permitted to armaments manufacturers.

Our readers will recall that no sooner had this law been passed than the West Coast aircraft manufacturers, *including the North American Aviation Corporation,* immediately went into action. They dispatched a letter to William S. Knudsen, Chairman of the then existing National Defense Commission, boldly threatening that unless the 8% profit limitation was removed, they would be constrained "to cooperate less heartily with the government." They proceeded to organize a boycott against the government, refusing to accept any more orders for aircraft. The East Coast producers announced their solidarity with their Western competitors. At the same time, the board of Directors of the Packard Company refused to accept an order for the manufacture of 9,000 Rolls Royce engines for the British and American air forces, which the Ford Company had previously turned down.

What happened? Did President Roosevelt call out the armed forces against these saboteurs of the nation's "defense" program? Not by a long shot! On July 11th, the White House announced that an agreement had been reached with the recalcitrant aircraft manufacturers. This "agreement" was a complete backdown by the administration. The obnoxious 8% limitation of profits clause was to be eliminated. The manufacturers were to be permitted to write off additional investments in plant and equipment over a five year period, instead of depreciating them at standard rates which ordinarily run 15 to 25 years. In addition, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to advance substantial sums to finance the expansion of existing plants for armaments purposes.

Thus, in settling their "sit-down" strike, the aviation magnates got everything but the mint itself. All they lacked was a government decoration attesting to their sterling (in more ways than one!) patriotism.

It is plain that it does make a difference who does the striking against the sacred "National Defense." Unfortunately for the North American strikers, they were a bunch of pikers! All they wanted was a mere 10c an hour increase — that made them a bunch of reds, traitors and saboteurs.

Despite the fact that the manufacturers' "sit-down" of 1940 lasted for several months, stalled aircraft production at a crucial period in the rearmament program of American imperialism, and cost the government several thousands planes, there was no hysterical whipping up of hatred against the capitalist "strikers." The newspapers did not flaunt huge charts screaming how many millions of man-hours of labor had been lost and how much the nation's "defense" had been set back. Quite the contrary. The press for the most part suppressed the news of the capitalist refusal to produce for their government, or gave it favorable notice when it was mentioned.

The Inglewood strikers were out but two days, but to listen to the ravings of the capitalist press one might suppose the entire program for their national "defense" had been stalled. It certainly makes a difference whose ox is gored.

CAPITAL PROTECTED

A number of capitalist sources have expressed opposition to the action of the President in taking over the property of the North American Aviation Corporation and operating it under government auspices. They maintain that not only is such action an invasion of the rights of private property, but it plays into the hands of the labor agitators. They argue: why should labor profit by its own "misdeeds" while innocent capital is made to suffer; for, once the government takes over a struck plant, wage increases will be in order, and this is precisely what labor is angling for.

We can reassure these frightened souls. There is no need for capital to be unduly alarmed. Its interests will be well taken care of by the political representatives of capitalism. It can rely on the highest authorities for this assurance. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, who took over the North American plant under the President's order, told his press conference that "Mr. J. H. Kindelberger, its (North American Aviation's) president, has a very good reputation with this government for making airplanes and as a square-shooter. There are not enough like him. We do not want to do injury to such a man. You may draw your own inferences from this."

(*Continued on page* 8)

We Are In This War!

President Roosevelt's latest fireside chat, capped as it was by the proclamation of an "Unlimited Emergency" should set at rest the last lingering doubts and false hopes of those who think that the United States is not yet at war and that peace is still a possibility.

LABOR POWER has repeatedly pointed out in recent months that the country *is now,* and has been for some time past, actually at war with the Axis powers. In view of this fact, all talk of keeping this country out of war, or of aiding Britain "short of war" is so much eye-wash when it is not the confused drivel of bankrupt pacifism.

The tenor and the form of the President's address and his "Emergency" proclamation can be mistaken by none for the words of a spokesman for a nation still at peace. Let no one be deceived by the reflection that, after all, only Congress may declare war, that it has not done so and shows no disposition to do so. Legally and technically that is true. But in the present world crisis all the old forms of diplomatic procedure and constitutional and legal ritual have gone by the board.

As the world has seen time and again in the last decade, modern wars begin long before they are officially declared and often long before the actual shooting starts. Capitalists isolationists and petty-bourgeois pacifists may, ostrich-like, bury their heads in the sands and keep on crying "peace, peace" when there is no peace, but the capitalist class as a whole and its political representatives in Washington know better.

WAR DECLARATIONS OUTMODED

"Democratic" imperialism represented by the most powerful nations on the earth, Great Britain and the United States, finds its domination over the world's trade, markets, colonies and sources of raw materials challenged by the "have-not" totalitarian imperialism linked in the Axis group, Germany, Italy and Japan. In the United States the Roosevelt administration, thoroughly aware of the inroads that the Axis has already made in Europe and the grave danger that a complete victory will constitute to American vested interests, is taking the necessary steps to fight fire with fire. In this struggle legality, constitutional guaranties and restrictions as well as other juridical impediments all have been thrown overboard as so much excess baggage.

ROOSEVELT'S WAR POLICY

Unencumbered by the restrictions of official position or the necessity of observing certain forms to placate a possible hostile public opinion, the *New York Herald Tribune,* leading journalistic spokesman for the interventionist forces, makes no bones about the fact that a formal declaration of war is no longer necessary to institute a shooting war with the Nazi regime. On May 28th, the morning after the President's speech, the *Herald Tribune* boldly announced:

"The President's address last night was a masterly statement of the actual case now actually before the American poeple; it was a masterly call to every form of action—on the seas and in the factories, in the offices of industrial management, in the home, on the streets and in the headquarters of organized labor—which may be necessary to meet that case.

"It carried a declaration of 'unlimited' emergency, and on the facts which it soberly recited this is an emergency calling for an effort on which no limits can be placed. It was not a declaration of war on Germany. That would not have been within the Presidential power. It would not even have come within the dictates of the kind of strategy which totalitarian war has imposed upon the world. It is folly today to explain to these people in advance exactly what one intends to do, just as it is folly to bind one's own policy in legalistic obedience to self-denying ordinances of a sort which they have never for a moment accepted for themselves. It is a declaration that the United States will do whatever is required and wherever it may be required, to defend itself against the colossal menace which has been raised against the world of freedom and democracy. And it is an unequivocal declaration that the United Satese 'will not permit' a realization of the Nazi dream of conquest, and 'will not accept a Hitler-dominated world.'"

What the *Herald Tribune* could shout from the housetops in thunderous and unmistake-

able accents, the President, in deference to public opinion, had to gloss over. Nevertheless, in his speech the President made it clear that any attempt on Hitler's part to acquire bases vital for an attack on the Western Hemisphere, such as the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands or Dakar, would be forcibly resisted by the American government. The policy of the American government, President Roosevelt declared, will be as follows:

"First, we shall actively resist wherever necessary, and with all our resources, every attempt by Hitler to extend his Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere, or to threaten it. . . .

"Secondly, from the point of view of strict naval and military necessity, we shall give every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain are resisting Hitlerism or its equivalent with force of arms. . . ."

Here is language so clear and explicit that its purpose cannot possibly be misunderstood. With not as much as a nod to Congress, which theoretically is supposed to have the power to put the country into war, Mr. Roosevelt presents Hitler with a shooting war.

PACIFIST PROTESTS FUTILE

This address was the culmination of a systematic campaign by the adminstration to prepare the minds of the American people for placing the country on a war footing. This was a necessary preliminary to meet any eventuality that may develop out of a shooting war which Roosevelt is deliberately provoking. The proclamation of "unlimited emergency", while it may not have added materially to the "war powers" already possessed by the President, served the psychological purpose of predisposing the American people to accept military counter-measures against expected German interference with American-borne war materials on the high seas.

While thus far Hitler has refused to rise to the Roosevelt provocations to commit an overt act which would enable the President to begin military reprisals, such an overt act with its bloody consequences is inevitable.

Roosevelt's backhand war maneuvers exposes the futility of the pacifist struggle against war which starts out with the promise that peace is possible under capitalism. More than 80% of the American people are recorded as being opposed to intervention in the present war and yet the country finds itself *actually at war* by virtue of executive fiat. And there is nothing that the capitalist isolationists or the petty-bourgeois pacifists can do about it except bleat about broken campain pledges and dictatorship.

Once war is legally declared the capitalist isolationists and most of their petty-bourgeois pacifists friends will run true to from by lining up with the Roosevelt administration in defense of American imperialism. Already the *Saturday Evening Post,* one of the leading exponents of capitalist isolation has withdrawn from the struggle and announced its support of the administration war policies on the ground that the President has already committed the country to war and it is the duty of all true 'patriots" to come to the country's defense. The Detroit *Free Press* likewise renounced its opposition to intervention in a statement declaring that: "We are in this war quite as though our Congress had made a formal declaration of hostilities. There is no turning back."

Of course what these super-patroits really mean, though they are a bit bashful in explaining, is that since they represent the minority wing of American imperialism which has been unsuccessful in its attempt to make an appeasement deal with Hitler, it now becomes necessary for them to bow to the majority's will so that a united front in the interests of American imperialism may be presented.

The bankruptcy of pacifism, on the other hand, is inherent in its very nature. Pacifism in its struggle against war, limits its efforts to creating a favorable public sentiment without attempting to alter the capitalist nature of the forces which make for war.

THE WAY OUT OF WAR

All the mediums of public sentiment—the press, the motion pictures, the radio, the schools, churches, etc., are (with few and unimportant exceptions insofar as the total result is concerned) lined up solidly with the forces result is concerned) lined solidly with the forces of intervention. All condone the Roosevelt maneuvers which have placed the country at war against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people. This is no accident. Each and every one of these agencies is run to serve the interests of the ruling class. For them to act contrary to the interests of Ameri-

(*Continued on Page* 12)

The Blitzkrieg Against Labor

(*Continued from page 2*)

You bet, Mr. Stimson! Wall Street takes your assurance at face value. The financial editor of the *New York Herald Tribune* next morning commented on the Army's taking over the Inglewood plant as follows:

"Secretary Stimson was reassuring yesterday in his comments on the management phase of the government's action in taking over the North American Aviation plant. Mr. Stimson had high praise for the company's officers, and by implication, at least, placed all odium in the case on strike leaders. He declined to comment on the present status of the concern's stockholders, but from the general tenor of his remarks the inference seemed to be that they would not suffer from the drastic move to break the strike. As a matter of fact, if the government is successful henceforth in keeping labor at work while disputes are under negotiation, stockholders generally in vital defense industries will be greatly benefited."

Incidentally, we almost forgot to mention that Mr. J. H. Kindelberger, who stands so high with Mr. Stimson's government, was one of the ringleaders in the successful holdup of the government staged by the aviation industry in the Spring of 1940.

* * *

The President's strikebreaking move has not only torn the mask from his own face, but it has also exposed the other "liberal" capitalist professed friends of labor.

Senator George Norris of Nebraska, had already previously come out for the prohibition of "defense" strikes as rendering aid and comfort to Hitler. *PM*, warmongering Roosevelt supporter, which has been at special pains to build up a pro-labor reputation, came out in full support of Roosevelt's strikebreaking, even though it simultaneously attacked the anti-labor policies of the North American management. In a signed editorial the publisher Ralph Ingersoll, says, "I do not think President Roosevelt could have taken any action at Inglewood other than he did. The country is in danger. This country is at war—whatever it is called in 1941. Other people have lost their liberty because their governments hesitated, did not value time. There is no longer any time to be wasted."

We beg to disagree most emphatically with Mr. Ingersoll and those who hold his views. Other countries did *not* lose their liberty because their governments hesitated, etc. Other countries—specifically France—lost their liberties because their ruling classes, fearing a working class revolution, sold out to the lesser evil, i. e., collaboration with the Hitler regime.

It is only too true that this country is in danger—mortal danger. But this danger does not arise from without—it is internal. Our real fascist menace is within our own country, in the camp of American imperialism itself. The new Roosevelt strikebreaking formula is but another link in the chain of fascist enslavement that is being forged for the American working class.

The Socialist Union Party, while recognizing that the "defense" strikes are far from being the "revolutionary plots" they are cracked up to be, nevertheless applauds the spirit of militancy and solidarity that have characterized them. The workers who have engaged in these strikes have done so in the face of the united opposition of all of capitalism's forces from the President down. In doing so they have given proof of the fact that they are capable of launching larger movements in the future, and will not always rest content to remain wage slaves of rapacious capitalism.

By all means the scourge of Hitlerism must be wiped out. But first let us start with our own Hitlers!

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FOR RADICALS

All books and pamphlets by Marx, Engels, Lenin, DeLeon, Trotsky, etc. We specialize in material on war economics, labor history, etc. Send for lists. We buy and sell.

LABOR PUBLICATIONS
Box 785, Chicago, Ill.

DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.

Send orders and remittances to the Business Manager, *Labor Power*— 140 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. C.

Labor Fakers at Work

Forty years ago Daniel De Leon, pioneer American Marxist, called attention to the deadly menace presented by the "Labor Leader" and the pernicious role that these labor lieutenants of the capitalist class play within the ranks of labor. In his famous address, "Two Pages From Roman History," De Leon warned the working class:

"The Labor Leader is nothing but a masked battery, from behind which the capitalist class can encompass what it could not without—the work of enslaving and slowly degrading the working class, and, along with that, the work of debasing and ruining the country."

Today, every day, the press and the radio continually confirm the correctness of De Leon's estimate of the part played by the labor fakers. In the present crisis of American imperialism, almost every leading labor union official is working day and night to further the war drive of the capitalist class and its government.

It would seem, at first blush, that the C.I.O. leadership is far more pro-working class than its A. F. of L. rivals. Outward appearances, it is true, give the impression that while the A. F. of L. top leadership is playing its traditional role of working class betrayal, such is not the case with the C.I.O. leadership. Unlike the chief A. F. of L. faker, William Green, President, Philip Murray of the C.I.O. has not been going around the country making speeches surrendering labor's right to strike.

A.F. of L. STOOL PIGEONING

Also unlike the blind and stupid Bourbon leadership of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. has not been parading its representatives before Congressional Committees and acting as stool pigeons against its rival to the applause of the labor haters. Green has actually condemned the C.I.O. for being responsible for 90% of the strikes in the war industries—as though this was some heinous crime. On the other hand, the C.I.O. has recognized the fascist implications of the vicious and crippling anti-labor legislation being pushed in the halls of Congress and the various state legislatures, and has vigorously condemned it, while the A.F. of L. has been too busy proclaiming its loyalty to capitalism to pay any heed to the workers' interests.

The further point is made that, even though Murray, for "practical" reasons, succumbed to administration pressure and consented to become a member of the National Defense Mediation Board, he had nevertheless had previously made public his view attributing anti-labor propensities to this Board and pointing out that:

"Such a board 'will necessarily find its attention directed against labor in order to maintain the status quo as much as possible' and will strive to stop 'wage increases or improvements of working conditions for labor.'

"Compulsory arbitration will result from board activities, since it would enter situations where collective bargaining was in process to 'bring terrific pressure to bear on labor to agree to arbitration in practically all situations.' . . .

"The setup of the proposed board carries strong anti-labor possibilities in the three members supposed to represent the public. These members 'are to settle controversies, make special investigations, hold hearings and issue reports, and arbitrate disputes,' making them the real powers in the board, since the other members representing labor and industry would simply have advisory powers.

" 'It has been the experience of labor that representatives from the public are usually taken from the ranks of retired business men,' Murray wrote."

Finally, the C.I.O. unions in the field were really manifesting an aggressive and militant attitude in opposition to the Roosevelt "Let us all sacrifice for National Defense" hokum, calling strike after strike in defiance of the wishes of the administration.

THE REAL C.I.O. ROLE

Thus it would seem that the C.I.O. leadership, in contradiction to the A.F. of L., is really carrying on a principled struggle in the interests of their working class rank and file. This conclusion, however, would merely be a superficial judgment, with no basis in reality. For in truth both groups of fakers are playing the role of "a masked battery" of capitalism within the camp of labor.

An "inside" revelation of the real role being played by the C.I.O. top leadership is supplied in a recent article by Stanley G. Thompson which appeared in the March 31st issue of *Barron's National Weekly*, authoritative journal of Wall Street opinion. According to this:

"From the first the defense authorities have had little difficulty with the so-called top leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organization and the American Federation of Labor. Most of these leaders have 'cooperated' not only with patriotic statements, but also by giving moderating counsel to their organizers and members whenever they had an opportunity to do so. Some of the top officers of unions have devoted more time to mediation efforts in recent weeks than to fighting the cause of their members.

"But, for the most part, union members who have felt they had justification for a strike have ignored the pleas of leaders; in some cases, they have actually defied them and there was nothing the big chiefs could do about it.

"In view of these facts it is not too much to say that the strikes have had some aspects of a popular uprising—an uprising directed against (1) the labor policies of individual firms concerned, (2) the Administration's let-us-all-sacrifice-for-defense policy and (3) their own leadership.

"It is this aspect which is particularly disturbing to the Administration and which makes the problem so difficult to handle. A government can always deal with a strongly-led opposition—or revolt, to use a harsh word—by suppressing the leadership, or buying it off with some sort of compromise. A movement from below is a different matter, especially when its adherents include thousands of churchgoing, property-owning citizens (as many strikers are)."

Here is a simple and convincing explanation of the seemingly "radical" role that the C.I.O. leaders have publicly played. Since their rank and file membership have from the very inception of the C.I.O. been the most militant section of the labor movement, matured in the traditions of the sit-down strikes, it was necessary for the leadership to re-echo the "radical" sentiments of the members, the better to win their confidence, for the ultimate job of bell-wethering them into submission to the dictates of American imperialism.

No doubt there still would have remained many doubting Thomases who would have refused to credit Mr. Thompson's revelations and clung to their faith in the working class devotion of the C.I.O. leadership, had not the President's action in calling out the Army to break the North American Aircraft strike exposed their duplicity. However, the alliance between the Roosevelt administration and the C.I.O. officialdom to drive the Inglewood strikers back to work must now convince the most credulous that Mr. Thompson was correct when he reported that behind the scenes the C.I.O. leaders were doing everything in their power to discourage strikes and put a damper on the militancy of the rank and file.

The C.I.O. bureaucrats, although far more intelligent and alive to the social forces at work than the torpid A.F. of L., yield nothing to their older rivals in their devoted loyalty to American imperialism's "defense" program. While Murray has not been as blatant as Green in his public expressions of this loyalty, it is only because of disappointment at the minor role that the President has thus far allotted to "labor," i.e., to Mr. Murray and his minor hangers-on. Mr. Murray is a patriot, loyal to the core, whose high qualities are universally acclaimed by the capitalistic press, which constantly refers to him as "honest, able and courageous." This is their way of acknowledging that Murray is not blind to the "rights" of capital.

Only slightly different is the position of John L. Lewis, the Colossus of the C.I.O., who sulks in his tent, only to emerge every now and then to growl at the administration and make common cause with its political opponents. This attitude, however, is not at all due to his disillusionment with capitalism but to his disappointed political ambitions. Lewis's loyalty to capitalism is of long standing and is attested to by a long and unbroken series of working class betrayals. Like Mr. Murray's devotion, Lewis's regard for the employers is unquestionable.

However bitter the organizational rivalry between the two camps of labor fakers may be, they stand like granite in defense of their imperialist masters, whose faithful labor lieutenants they remain. The workers can expect naught from them but betrayal after betrayal.

It is the duty of every class conscious worker to aid in exposing the treacherous role played by the labor misleaders, to the end that the working class may be aroused to drive them out of the labor movement.

THOMAS WHITEWASHES LINDBERGH

(*Continued from Page 2*)

disapproval? By gently slapping him on the wrist and proceeding to absolve him on the following grounds:

LINDBERGH'S ALIBIS

A. Lindbergh repudiated Verne Marshall and his Committee. Thomas seems to forget that Lindbergh repudiated this outfit only *after* it was publicly revealed that the principal financial supporter of the Committee was a notorious American business agent for Hitler, thus impairing the further usefulness of the committee. Subsequently Verne Marshall himself repudiated his own committee by dissolving it and recommending that its sympathizers adhere to Lindbergh's group, the America First Committee.

B. Lindbergh's public statement: "The defeat of Great Britain would be a tragedy." If Thomas believes that this makes Lindbergh an enemy of Fascism how does he explain the fact that Rudolf Hess also believes that the defeat of Great Britain would be tragic?

C. Lindbergh's further statement: "The nation must protect and advance the ideals of democracy." This maneuver is so ancient that by this time even the most naive should no longer be taken in by it. Hitler proclaimed that he was fighting to emancipate the working class when he was struggling for power. So what? Actions speak louder than words. What is Lindbergh's record in defense of civil liberties? Has he lifted his voice, *even once,* in opposition to the open campaign which is being waged throughout the country against civil liberties and the trade union movement? Not as far as we are aware! Yet Thomas finds it possible to believe his protestation of democracy!

D. Lindbergh supports the America First Committee, whose New York local chapter has exhibited liberal tendencies on various occasions. Here Thomas conveniently overlooks the real supporters behind the National America First Committee: the General Woods, the Ernest T. Wiers, the Tom Girdlers, the Max Babbs, et al. These are, indeed, doughty warriors in the cause of democracy!

* * *

Both Trager and Thomas have overlooked the real point of Lindbergh's fascist proclivities. Lindbergh has publicly stated that a Nazi victory would not imperil the United States and that it would be possible for the United States to exist side by side with the Hitler regime in a Nazi-dominated world on terms of amity and peace. Here we find the Lone Eagle espousing, wittingly or unwittingly, the central theme of all of Hitler's propaganda directed toward America.

FASCISM ON THE MARCH

LABOR POWER holds no brief for American imperialism. We repeat once more that just as surely as day follows night, unless the American workers wake up and proceed to replace capitalism with the Socialist Republic of Labor in the time that is still left to them, the vicory of fascism is inevitable. Nevertheless, he who fails to comprehend that a Nazi victory in Europe will help to accelerate the victory of fascism here in the United States (unless the workers intervene) does not understand even the A B C's of the mighty social forces that are now convulsing the world. Those who speak of the possibility of the United States living in peace and friendship with a victorious Nazi regime in reality are saying that they are prepared to fascize the United States to win the good will of Hitler. This is the real game that Lindbergh is playing. Yet Norman Thomas, the innocent abroad, sees fit to vouch for him!

Pacifism makes strange bedfellows. The sight of Norman Thomas coming to the rescue of Lindbergh, the fair-haired boy of American fascism is enough to make the angels weep. Yet the spectacle of Thomas and Lindbergh together in the same camp is not so incongruous a sight as may appear at first blush. In their opposition to the war both proceed from a common premise (if we grant Thomas's contention that Lindbergh's peace efforts are bona-fide and principled). *Both believe that peace is possible within the framework of capitalism.*

It is Thomas's privilege to join Lindbergh and the bourgeois pacifists in spreading the pleasant opium that a lasting peace is possible under capitalism. But that is not the position of scientific Socialism, nor is it the truth. It is merely the position of bourgeois pacifism, which in its opposition to war starts with capitalism and winds up with capitalism.

DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.

Send orders and remittances to the Business Manager, *Labor Power*— 140 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. C.

NO PEACE WITHOUT SOCIALISM

Scientific Socialism teaches that the abolition of militarism and war, that a permanent and real peace, is possible only by first abolishing capitalism. As Rosa Luxemburg wrote many years ago: "Militarism in both its forms—as war and as armed peace—is a legitimate child, a logical result of capitalism, which can be overcome by the destruction of capitalism, and that hence whoever desire world peace and liberation from the tremendous burden of armaments must also desire Socialism."

It is quite true that Thomas pays lip service to the principle that Socialism alone can establish and guarantee enduring peace. BUT HIS EVERY ACTION BELIES HIS WORDS. Thomas, just like Lindbergh, supports capitalist National 'Defense," and "Defense of the Western Hemisphere," slogans which in reality mean the maintenance of United States hegemony over the two American continents. Just like Lindbergh, Thomas works for a "negotiated peace" under capitalism. This course of action is not Socialist but bourgeois and pacifist.

It is hard to believe that the class conscious elements left in the Socialist Party and the Young Peoples Socialist League approve of Thomas's latest manifestation of bourgeois pacifism—his united front with Lindbergh. We prefer to believe that they still march under the banner of scientific Socialism and its class conscious program of combatting war and fascism by means of the workers' revolution. To paraphrase a thought uttered by Rosa Luxemburg:

THE SOCIALIST TASK

The task of the Socialist in the present world crisis is not only to demonstrate vigorously at all times a love of peace, but first and foremost to make clear to the masses at all times the nature of capitalism and militarism; sharply and clearly to bring out the difference in principle between the standpoint of Socialism and that of the bourgeois peace enthusiasts; to explain this to the masses; to scatter all illusions with regard to attempts at peace made by the bourgeoisie; and to declare the abolition of capitalism as the first and only step toward world peace.

We call upon the class conscious members of the Socialist Party and the Y.P.S.L. to speak out in repudiating the non-working class attitude of their leaders, and to join with advanced workers everywhere in resolutely carrying on the struggle against the deadly poison of bourgeois pacifism within the Socialist movement.

WE ARE IN THIS WAR!

(Continued from page 7)

can capitalism is inconceivable.

There is only *one* way to wage a successful campaign against the evil of war. That way is to correlate the struggle with the basic struggle against capitalism, the creator of war. To attempt to separate the two battles so as "to work with the material at hand," i.e., to unite on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays with the capitalist isolationists, and to utter pious Socialist platitudes on war on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays is to serve only the interests of capitalist reaction by confusing the workers. Such a course strengthens the illusions of the workers in the capitalist state machinery and its sham democracy. Worst of all, it breeds the false notion that war can be prevented under capitalism.

The President, speaking for American imperialism, has set the course toward open war. Only the workers, organizing their forces on the political as well as the industrial fields, can head him off. And they can do so only if they fight under the banner of the abolition of capitalism, the cause of war.

Only Socialism can destroy fascism!